

HONORABLE JAMES L. ROBERT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

RICHARD AUSTIN, an individual, on  
behalf of himself, the general public, and  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware  
Corporation authorized to do business in  
the State of Washington,

Defendant.

Case No. C-09-1679 JLR

**JOINT STATUS REPORT AND RULE 26(f)  
DISCOVERY PLAN**

Plaintiff Richard Austin (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Amazon.com, Inc. (“Defendant”) submit the following Joint Status Report pursuant to the Court’s *Scheduling Order*.

1 **I. NATURE OF THE CASE**

2 **A. Plaintiff's Claims**

3 Plaintiff claims that Defendant's policy of rounding off time to the nearest seven and one  
4 half minutes combined with its other policies and procedures violates the overtime provisions of  
5 the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. Section 207, and those applicable state laws that mirror  
6 or adopt by reference the federal overtime law.

7 **B. Defendant's Defenses**

8 Defendant denies any liability for Plaintiff's claims, and is moving this Court to dismiss  
9 Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint with prejudice for failure to state a claim, on the grounds  
10 that the conduct at issue – maintaining both a rounding policy and an attendance policy – is not  
11 unlawful and Plaintiff has failed to provide any factual support showing that he was actually  
12 harmed by these policies. The Motion to Dismiss is noted for March 26, 2010.

13 **II. STATEMENT OF ADR METHOD**

14 Should the case remain pending, the parties propose engaging in private mediation within  
15 eight (8) months from the filing of this Report. This will allow time for the adjudication of  
16 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and for discovery sufficient to facilitate a meaningful mediation.

17 **III. JOINDER OF ADDITIONAL PARTIES**

18 The parties are not aware of any additional parties to be joined at this time.

19 **IV. DISCOVERY**

20 **A. FRCP 26(f) Conference and FRCP 26(a) Initial Disclosures**

21 The parties participated in a conference pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) on February 25,  
22 2010. Given that the pending Motion to Dismiss, if granted in whole or in part, would dispose of  
23 one or all of Plaintiff's claims, the Parties propose delaying the exchange of initial disclosures  
24 until after the Court has ruled on the Motion to Dismiss and the pleadings are settled.

25 **B. Subject of Discovery**

26 Plaintiff anticipates seeking discovery on Defendant's payroll and timekeeping policies  
27 and electronic records. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint should be  
28 dismissed, with prejudice, and no discovery would therefore be needed. Should the Court deny

1 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss in whole or in part, the parties will embark on discovery and will  
2 update the Court accordingly.

3 **C. Changes to Discovery Limitations**

4 The parties do not, at this time, propose any additional changes to the limitations on  
5 discovery imposed under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

6 **D. Expense Management**

7 Should the Court deny Defendant's Motion to Dismiss in whole or in part, the parties  
8 propose exchanging some documents pertaining to Plaintiff informally. Defendant also proposes  
9 focusing discovery on the viability of Plaintiff's individual claims and issues relevant to  
10 collective certification prior to the adjudication of any collective notice motion.

11 **E. Orders**

12 The parties do not propose that the Court enter any other orders under Fed. R. Civ. P 26(c)  
13 or under Local Rule CR 16(b) and (c).

14 **V. CUT-OFF DATES AND SCHEDULING**

15 The parties agree that setting deadlines for discovery cut-off before the Court has ruled on  
16 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is premature. The parties propose submitting an additional Joint  
17 Status Report with deadlines after the Court has ruled on the Motion to Dismiss and the pleadings  
18 are settled, at which time the parties will be better able to assess the nature and extent of  
19 discovery needed to prepare for summary judgment, collective certification and trial.

20 **VI. REFERRAL TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

21 The parties do not consent to the assignment of this case to a full-time Magistrate Judge.

22 **VII. BIFURCATION**

23 Defendant asserts that, should the Court deny Defendant's Motion to Dismiss in whole or  
24 in part, discovery should be bifurcated. Specifically, prior to certification, discovery should be  
25 focused on the merits of Plaintiff's individual claim and on issues relevant to collective  
26 certification.

27 **VIII. PRE-TRIAL STATEMENTS**

28 The parties assert that determining the necessity of pretrial statements and pretrial orders

1 is premature at this time. Should the Court deny Defendant's Motion to Dismiss in whole or in  
 2 part, the parties will be better able to assess this issue after conducting discovery and engaging in  
 3 private mediation.

4 **IX. SUGGESTIONS FOR SHORTENING/SIMPLIFYING CASE**

5 In addition to the suggestions described above, Defendant submits that issues in this case  
 6 may be narrowed by a dispositive motion for summary judgment.

7 **A. Estimate of Trial Date**

8 The parties cannot anticipate at this early stage when this case will be ready for trial.

9 **B. Demand for Jury Trial**

10 Plaintiff seeks a non-jury trial.

11 **C. Estimate of Trial Time**

12 The parties cannot anticipate at this early stage the number of trial days needed to  
 13 adjudicate the issues in this case.

14 **X. NAMES, ADDRESSES AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS OF TRIAL COUNSEL**

15 A complete list of counsel representing the parties are provided below.

16 **XI. SERVICE OF PARTIES**

17 All defendants have been served.

18 **XII. SCHEDULING CONFERENCE**

19 The parties do not request a scheduling conference prior to a scheduling order being  
 20 entered in this case.

1 Dated: February 26, 2010

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

2  
3 By /s/ Theresa Mak  
4 Theresa Mak

5 REBECCA EISEN, State Bar No. 96129  
6 THERESA MAK, State Bar No. 211435  
7 *Admitted pro hac vice*  
8 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
9 One Market, Spear Street Tower  
10 San Francisco, CA 94105-1126  
11 Tel: 415.442.1000  
12 Fax: 415.442.1001  
13 [reisen@morganlewis.com](mailto:reisen@morganlewis.com)  
14 [tmak@morganlewis.com](mailto:tmak@morganlewis.com)

15 RICHARD G. ROSENBLATT, State Bar No.  
16 RR6720  
17 *Admitted pro hac vice*  
18 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
19 502 Carnegie Center  
20 Princeton, NJ 08540-6241  
21 Tel: 609.919.6600  
22 Fax: 609.919.6701  
23 [rosenblatt@morganlewis.com](mailto:rosenblatt@morganlewis.com)

24 HARRY KORRELL, State Bar No. 23173  
25 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
26 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200  
27 Seattle, WA 98101-3045  
28 Tel: 206.757.8080  
Fax: 206.757.7700  
[harrykorrell@dwt.com](mailto:harrykorrell@dwt.com)

Attorneys for Defendant  
AMAZON.COM INC.

21 Dated: February 26, 2010

THIERMAN LAW FIRM

23 By /s/ Mark R. Thierman  
24 Mark R. Thierman, NV Bar # 8285  
25 THIERMAN LAW FIRM  
26 7287 Lakeside Drive  
27 Reno, NV 89511  
28 Tel: 775.284.1500

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Matthew J. Ide, WSBA No. 26002  
IDE LAW OFFICE  
Admitted pro hac vice  
801 Second Avenue, Suite 1502  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Tel: 206.625.1326  
Fax: 206.622.0909  
[reisen@morganlewis.com](mailto:reisen@morganlewis.com)  
[tmak@morganlewis.com](mailto:tmak@morganlewis.com)

David R. Markham, CA Bar No. 071814  
CLARK & MARKHAM LLP  
600 B Street, Suite 2130  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: 619.239.1321

Walter Haines, CA Bar No. 071074  
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC  
65 Pine Avenue, #312  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
Tel: 877.696.8378

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
RICHARD AUSTIN

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this date I served true and correct copies of the foregoing document(s) on parties and their counsel of record, in the manner indicated:

Matthew J. Ide, WSBA No. 26002  
IDE LAW OFFICE  
801 Second Avenue, Suite 1502  
Seattle, WA 98104-1500  
Tel: (206) 625-1326  
Fax: (206) 622-0909  
email: [mjide@yahoo.com](mailto:mjide@yahoo.com)

- ☐ Via Messenger
- ☒ Via ECF Notification
- ☐ Via Electronic Mail
- ☐ Via U.S. Mail
- ☐ Via Overnight Delivery

David R. Markham, CA Bar No. 071814  
CLARK & MARKHAM LLP  
600 "B" Street, Suite 2130  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 239-1321  
email: [dmarkham@clarkmarkham.com](mailto:dmarkham@clarkmarkham.com)

- ☐ Via Messenger
- ☒ Via ECF Notification
- ☐ Via Electronic Mail
- ☐ Via U.S. Mail
- ☐ Via Overnight Delivery

Mark R. Thierman, NV Bar No. 8285  
THIERMAN LAW FIRM  
7287 Lakeside Drive  
Reno, NV 89511  
Tel: (775) 284-1500  
email: [laborlawyer@pacbell.net](mailto:laborlawyer@pacbell.net)

- ☐ Via Messenger
- ☒ Via ECF Notification
- ☐ Via Electronic Mail
- ☐ Via U.S. Mail
- ☐ Via Overnight Delivery

Walter Haines, CA Bar No. 071074  
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP,  
PC  
65 Pine Avenue, #312  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
Tel: (877) 696-8378  
email: [walterhaines@uelglaw.com](mailto:walterhaines@uelglaw.com)

- ☐ Via Messenger
- ☒ Via ECF Notification
- ☐ Via Electronic Mail
- ☐ Via U.S. Mail
- ☐ Via Overnight Delivery

Dated this 26th day of February 2010

/s/ Theresa Mak  
Theresa Mak

DB2/21560898.4